

May 22, 1981

LB 243, 316, 472,
506, 506A

RECESS

SPEAKER MARVEL PRESIDING

SPEAKER MARVEL: Record your presence please. Some of you haven't recorded your presence. Would you please record so we can proceed? Senator Schmit, do you want to record your presence please? Senator Burrows, do you want to record your presence? Okay, record.

CLERK: There is a quorum present, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, Mr. Clerk. (Gavel.) We are ready for the Haberman amendment to 243. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I am about to sign and do sign reengrossed LB 316; engrossed LB 506; engrossed LB 506A; engrossed LB 472. Okay, ready.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Haberman has an amendment to LB 243.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, although there seems to be some Senators who are not listening, I will go ahead and explain the amendment anyway. This amendment says that the bill, 243, shall not apply to any project where construction bids were let prior to the effective date of this act which is to be funded in whole or in part from contributions by private individuals or organizations. That is all it says, any projects that have been started that are funded in whole or in part from contributions by private individuals or organizations. Now you may wonder why I am offering another amendment similar to the other one when I was beaten. The reason I am doing this is to see if some of those Senators who promised me to vote for the other one and changed their minds and/or didn't vote would like to change their ways and support the amendment. So there is no need arguing or trying to explain it. It pertains to the same thing but it just says where private or individual funds have been contributed. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I was going to ask if this wasn't a reconsideration but Senator Haberman has just conceded that it is the same thing, it is a reconsideration, so I believe the motion is out of order and should be so ruled. He admitted it was a